

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objections to claims 4-6:

Claims 4-6 are objected to due to informalities. Appropriate correction is required.

5

Response:

Each of the claims 4-6 has been amended to correct spacing errors present in the original claims. In addition, claims 10-12 and 14 have been amended to replace the potentially indefinite phrase "capable of" with more definite claim language.

10

Acceptance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 1, 3-5, and 10-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e):

Claims 1, 3-5, and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Peeters et al. (US 6,628,738).

15

Response:

The claims of the instant application are based on differential phase offset (DPO) and subsequent processing algorithms, which Peeters et al does not teach.

20

Nevertheless, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claims 6 and 7, and no new matter has been entered. Claims 6 and 7 have subsequently been cancelled and claims 8 and 9 have been amended to depend on claim 1. Claim 7 had been indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Thus, the amended claim 1 should now be in allowable form.

25

Similarly, claim 10 has been amended to include the same limitations as

contained in the original claims 6 and 7. Thus, claim 10 should also be in allowable form after this amendment.

5 Furthermore, claims 3-5 and 11-12 are dependent on claims 1 and 10, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 3-5, and 10-12 is therefore respectfully requested.

3. Rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

10 Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peeters et al. in view of Belotserkovsky et al. (US 6,628,735).

Response:

15 Claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claim 2 is therefore respectfully requested.

4. Rejection of claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peeters et al. in view of Ramasubamanian et al. (US 7,133,474).

20 **Response:**

Claim 6 and 13 are cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration.

5. Rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

25 Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peeters et al. in view of Van Acker et al. (US 6,744,821).

Response:

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 10, and should be allowed if claim 10 is

allowed. Reconsideration of claim 14 is therefore respectfully requested.

6. Introduction to new claims 15 and 16:

5 Claims 15 and 16 are newly drafted to be dependent on claim 10, and are
substantial duplicates of original claims 8 and 9. No new matter is added, and
acceptance of new claims 15 and 16 is respectfully requested.

10 In view of the claim amendments and the above arguments in favor of
patentability, the applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be
issued in this case.

Sincerely yours,



Date: 02.26.2007

15 Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

20

Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C.
is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)